

## REMARKS

Claims 1-82 were pending and are subject to a restriction requirement under 35 U.S.C.

§ 121. The Examiner requested restriction to one of the following inventions:

- I. Claims 1-22 and 56-82
- II. Claims 23-55

This restriction requirement is respectfully traversed. However, Applicants elect to prosecute in this application Invention I as defined by claims 1-22 and 56-82. Applicants have cancelled claims 23-55.

Claims 1-82 were pending, of which claims 23-55 have been cancelled. Claims 1-22 and 56-82 stand rejected. Claims 5-6, 21-70, 72-73, and 82 have been cancelled. Claims 1, 3-4, 7-20, 71, and 75 have been amended. Claims 83-84 have been added. Upon entry of this amendment, claims 1-4, 7-20, 71, 74-81, and 83-84 are pending.

Claim 70 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 63 and 70 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Claims 63 and 70 have been cancelled.

Claims 1-2, 4-7, 9-11, 13, 15-16, 19-20, 71-75, and 77-78 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Anderson. Applicants respectfully traverse.

### CLAIM 1

As amended, claim 1 recites:

In a computer-implemented animation system, a method for animating an object, the method comprising:

- receiving a first input, the first input specifying a first parameter behavior, the first parameter behavior indicating how to change a value of a first parameter over time, wherein the first parameter is associated with one element of a group consisting of a motion behavior applied to the object, a filter applied to the object, and a generator applied to the object;

animating the object by changing the value of the first parameter over time according to the specified parameter behavior; and outputting the animated object.

Claim 1 recites, in part, a “first parameter behavior indicating how to change a value of a first parameter over time, wherein the first parameter is associated with one element of a group consisting of a motion behavior applied to the object, a filter applied to the object, and a generator applied to the object.”

In one embodiment, the “first parameter” is associated with a motion behavior applied to an object. The animation caused by a motion behavior can be customized by specifying a value for one or more parameters associated with the behavior (§228). Since a parameter behavior can indicate how to change the value of a motion behavior parameter over time, applying a parameter behavior can customize the animation caused by the motion behavior.

In other embodiments, the “first parameter” is associated with a filter applied to an object or a generator applied to an object. The visual effects caused by a filter or generator can be customized by specifying a value for one or more parameters associated with the filter or generator (§§239, 240). Since a parameter behavior can indicate how to change the value of a filter parameter or generator parameter over time, applying a parameter behavior can customize the visual effects caused by the filter or generator.

Anderson does not disclose, teach, or suggest the claimed “first parameter behavior.” Anderson discusses a vector response characteristic that can be associated with an object (§20). When a vector is applied to the object, the object’s vector response characteristic specifies how the representation of the object changes in response to the applied vector (§20). A vector can include a magnitude, a direction, and an application time (§24).

Assume, *arguendo*, that Anderson's vector response characteristic is similar to the claimed "motion behavior applied to the object." In this case, the claimed "first parameter" that is associated with the motion behavior would be a parameter of the vector response characteristic – namely, the applied vector (which includes a magnitude, a direction, and an application time). Anderson does not disclose how to change these values (magnitude, direction, application time) over time. Thus, Anderson does not disclose "the first parameter behavior indicating how to change a value of a first parameter over time, wherein the first parameter is associated with ... a motion behavior applied to the object."

Also, Anderson mentions neither filters nor generators. Thus, Anderson does not disclose, teach, or suggest "receiving a first input, the first input specifying a first parameter behavior, the first parameter behavior indicating how to change a value of a first parameter over time, wherein the first parameter is associated with one element of a group consisting of a motion behavior applied to the object, a filter applied to the object, and a generator applied to the object."

Anderson does not anticipate claim 1 for at least this reason.

#### **CLAIM 71**

As amended, claim 71 recites:

A method for animating an object using a behavior, comprising:  
    outputting an original animation for the object according to a first behavior;  
    concurrently with outputting the object animation, accepting user input that comprises a command for changing a value of a parameter of the first behavior; and  
    outputting an updated animation for the object according to the changed value of the parameter.

Anderson does not disclose, teach, or suggest "concurrently with outputting the object animation, accepting user input that comprises a command for changing a value of a parameter of the first behavior." Anderson discusses applying a force to an object in real time during playback

(¶52). Animation of the object is then based on the net effect of the original force, the gravity force, and the (new) downward force (¶52). In other words, Anderson discusses adding a new force in real time. Anderson does not discuss changing a value of a parameter of a behavior (e.g., modifying an existing force) in real time.

Thus, Anderson does not disclose, teach, or suggest “concurrently with outputting the object animation, accepting user input that comprises a command for changing a value of a parameter of the first behavior.” Anderson does not anticipate claim 71 for at least this reason.

### **CLAIM 83**

Although new claim 83 has not been rejected, Applicants note the following:

Anderson does not disclose, teach, or suggest a “first behavior indicating how to change a value of a first parameter of the object over time ... wherein the first behavior comprises one from a group consisting of: a Snap Alignment to Motion behavior; an Align to Motion behavior; an Attracted To behavior; ....”

Anderson discusses a vector response characteristic that can be associated with an object in an image (¶20). A user can apply a vector to the object (¶20). A computer can then determine the changes in the object's representation in subsequent frames of the animation from the applied vector and the object's vector response characteristic (¶20). None of the vector response characteristics discussed by Anderson result in a Snap Alignment to Motion behavior, an Align to Motion behavior, an Attracted To behavior, etc.

Thus, Anderson does not disclose, teach, or suggest “first behavior indicating how to change a value of a first parameter of the object over time ... wherein the first behavior comprises one from a group consisting of: a Snap Alignment to Motion behavior; an Align to

Motion behavior; an Attracted To behavior; ...” Anderson does not anticipate claim 83 for at least this reason.

#### **CLAIM 84**

Although new claim 84 has not been rejected, Applicants note the following:

Anderson does not disclose, teach, or suggest a “first behavior indicating how to change a value of a first parameter of the text object over time ... wherein the first behavior comprises one from a group consisting of: a Crawl Left behavior; a Crawl Right behavior; a Scroll Up behavior; ....”

Anderson discusses a vector response characteristic that can be associated with an object in an image (§20). A user can apply a vector to the object (§20). A computer can then determine the changes in the object's representation in subsequent frames of the animation from the applied vector and the object's vector response characteristic (§20). None of the vector response characteristics discussed by Anderson result in a Crawl Left behavior, a Crawl Right behavior, a Scroll Up behavior, etc. Also, Anderson does not disclose a text object.

Walton does not remedy this deficiency. Walton discusses enabling a user to animate custom graphical objects by creating frames (images) representing the desired output “behavior” (animation) (8:3-6). An animation can represent any transformation that a graphics editor can perform (e.g., change color, move, rotate, scale, stretch, etc.) (8:34-40). None of the animations discussed by Walton result in a Crawl Left behavior, a Crawl Right behavior, a Scroll Up behavior, etc. Also, Walton does not disclose a text object (8:44-65).

Thus, Anderson and Walton do not disclose, teach, or suggest (alone or in combination) a “first behavior indicating how to change a value of a first parameter of the text object over time ... wherein the first behavior comprises one from a group consisting of: a Crawl Left behavior; a

Crawl Right behavior; a Scroll Up behavior; ....” Anderson and Walton do not disclose, teach, or suggest (alone or in combination) claim 84 for at least this reason.

### **OTHER CLAIMS**

Claims 21-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Miyagawa. Claims 56 and 66-67 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Watanabe. Claims 56-60, 64-65, and 68 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anderson. Claims 56 and 61 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sowizral in view of Anderson. Claim 82 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anderson in view of Purcell. Claims 62-63 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anderson in view of Baraff in further view of Press. Claim 69 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anderson in view of Suzuki. Claims 21-22, 56-69, and 82 have been cancelled.

Claim 3 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anderson in view of Watanabe. Claim 8 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anderson in view of Walton. Claims 12, 14, and 17-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anderson in view of Miyagawa. Claims 76 and 79 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anderson in view of French. Claims 80-81 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anderson in view of Sowizral.


Applicants respectfully traverse. The claims not specifically mentioned above depend from their respective base claims, which were shown to be patentable over Anderson. In addition, these claims recite other features not included in their respective base claims. Thus, these claims

are patentable for at least the reasons discussed above, as well as for the elements that they individually recite.

Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims are allowable over the cited art of record and request that the Examiner allow this case. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned in order to advance the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,  
GREGORY E. NILES, ET AL.

Dated: 6-22-06

By:   
Sabra-Anne R. Truesdale, Reg. No.: 55,687  
Fenwick & West LLP  
Silicon Valley Center  
801 California Street  
Mountain View, CA 94041  
Tel.: (650) 335-7187  
Fax.: (650) 938-5200